

# Decoding infrared imprints of quantum origins of black holes

Sumanta Chakraborty<sup>\*1</sup> and Kinjalk Lochan<sup>†2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Theoretical Physics, Indian Association for the Cultivation of Science, Kolkata 700032, India

<sup>2</sup>Department of Physical Sciences, IISER Mohali, Manauli 140306, India

January 27, 2023

## Abstract

We analyze the emission pattern of a (fundamentally quantum) black hole in Kerr-Newman family in a model insensitive fashion. We demonstrate that, irrespective of the fundamental quantum theory, a macroscopic black hole always has non-continuously separated mass states, therefore they descend down in discrete manner. This discreteness can belong to either of two permissible classes if semiclassical physics and the laws of black hole thermodynamics are to emerge out from the quantum theory at the macroscopic level. We evaluate the step size in both these cases. Such a computation reveals a universal relation, in each class, between the dynamic and kinematic length scales for all black holes belonging to the Kerr-Newman family. This relation is basically made out of low energy parameters associated with a macroscopic black hole, but also reveals the parameters involved in the ultraviolet theory of it. Further, one can compute the maximal number of quanta a macroscopic black hole could emit before turning into a Planck sized remnant or a zero temperature object with extremal character, which in turn can be used to estimate the lifetime a black hole. We also argue the independence of these features from the spacetime dimensions.

## 1 Introduction

Realization of the fact that black holes behave as thermodynamical objects [1–10] have boosted the hope to reconcile the quantum theory with the framework of gravity in a successful and consistent manner. In particular, macroscopic geometric constructions of black holes along with the microscopic quantum character as suggested by their thermodynamical nature, demanded a quantum theory of space-time geometry. Thus demystifying and understanding the black hole geometry has been one of the pioneering goals of modern physics, which in all likelihood, will provide an useful insight to the quest of arriving at a successful quantum theory of gravity.

Different approaches towards quantizing gravity [11–14], emerging out since the discovery of black hole thermodynamics, have been accordingly oriented, keeping the hope of unifying gravity and quantum theory in sight. Unfortunately, despite decades of efforts along numerous directions, which have resulted into many promising candidates for quantum gravity, we have not been able to come up with a theory that can actually provide a consistent description to unify quantum theory and gravity. Each of these candidates has offered its own different pathway of studying and understanding different constructions of gravity, more

---

<sup>\*</sup>sumantac.physics@gmail.com

<sup>†</sup>kinjalk.lochan@gmail.com

particularly the black holes. However with no black holes available to experiment with, and a plethora of quantum gravity theories with their own predictions, the black hole mysteries [15–23] have led this search to a cross road. The amount of tussle and conceptual discomfort one has to swallow, in order to come up with something as exotic an object as the black hole, from an as fundamental theory as the quantum mechanics, has led to fierce debates on the naturalness and existence of the black hole itself [24–27]. Fortunately, detections of the gravitational waves [28, 29] from merger of two black holes have, for the moment, put the debates regarding the existence of black holes to oblivion. The spacetime ripples originating from the merger of two black holes following the general relativistic prediction has given a huge encouragement to the research of black holes in a more detailed fashion. There have been studies [30, 31] to explore the imprints of some non-intuitive quantum features of the black holes, which appear in many frameworks of quantum gravity. This fundamental discovery has also paved the way for asking more fundamental questions regarding the black holes, e.g., *is there any meaningful observational signatures of the quantum nature of black holes?* Therefore, the dynamical evolution of black holes can really act as a lead for testing of our theoretical models claiming to quantize gravity [32–34].

Apart from the classical gravitational wave emissions when a black hole is perturbed from its equilibrium configuration, there is also a quantum channel by which a black hole can emit *thermal* radiation, known as the famous *Hawking radiation* [7]. There is a renewed interest in the quantum emission profile of black holes after the realization gained ground that quantum emission of black holes may well be hiding its intrinsic quantum face [35–38]. Studies of such quantum emissions hold their own ground as the tussle between non-compatibility of the quantum theory with principles of gravity become manifest here, thanks to the thermal nature of the radiation [20, 39, 40].

In this work, what we are after, is the question *is there any model independent signature of the underlying quantum nature of black holes which gets fossilized in its emission?* In a previous work [38, 41], we have explicitly demonstrated that if black holes are indeed a macroscopic realization of a microscopic quantum geometry which have holographic properties, as required by the classical theory, then it is highly unlikely that the emission from them will have the suggested thermal behaviour. If the geometry (of black hole spacetime) gets discretized in any fashion, the emission lines from the macroscopic black hole become hugely discrete in the low frequency regime. Similar conclusions were reached in many other contexts and their far reaching implications are still being investigated [42–45].

However the scenario depicted in earlier works was for a black hole, with mass as the only hair [38, 41, 43–49]. However in astrophysical scenarios, a general black hole is most likely to inherit a non-zero angular momentum as well. Thus in the process of decay, the black hole loses both mass and angular momentum and as we have shown in this work, the inclusion of angular momentum modifies the quantum spectrum of a black hole drastically. In particular, as we will depict, there will be lot of interesting physics happening near the extremal limit, which was non-existent for Schwarzschild black hole. Further, since black holes are supposed to be thermodynamical objects in classical theory, they have to jump from one thermodynamical configuration to another, which are allowed by holography and the microscopic quantum description of the hole. Therefore, the emission lines must be consistent with both thermodynamics and the underlying quantum structure. As we will see, these two demands are strong enough to fix many characteristic features of black holes by not allowing them to emit at all wavelengths. In other words, the above requirements result into a discrete quantum spectrum for black holes [46–48]. This fact has been aptly demonstrated in the so called *Bekenstein-Mukhanov* effect, showing the existence of a minimum frequency and hence the largest wavelength that a black hole can emit. For Schwarzschild-like black holes, it is easy to demonstrate that this largest wavelength is a multiple of the horizon scale [38, 41, 46], which we argue, is in fact related to the de-Broglie wavelength associated with its thermality. Further, by working out the corresponding situation in the context of Kerr-Newman family of black holes, we will derive an universal relation relating

various wavelengths associated with this problem, which is independent of the number of hairs inherited by the black hole. *This relation works as a quantum gravitational book keeping parameter throughout the emission.* Therefore, this infrared character of the black hole emission will be able to make prediction of quantum gravity parameter of the black hole, serving as a infrared test for various theories. Thus, following the quantum rules, while keeping the thermodynamic properties in mind, in this work, we have been able to put forward some unique features of the emission spectra of a black hole. Furthermore, we have also demonstrated that, while in the earlier literature only integer shift scheme was advocated, it is possible to have a quantum structure which is Logarithmically discretized. Implications of such a new discretization scheme will also be discussed.

The paper is organized as follows: In [Section 2](#) we analyze the relation of the macroscopic geometric aspects of a black hole with the expectation of a fundamental quantum operator describing a black hole. This results into two ways a black hole can change its macroscopic configuration, either in integer steps or in a Logarithmic integer fashion. [Section 3](#) discusses the mass gap between the nearest macroscopic configuration emerging out from such a quantum operator which is discretized in integer steps. We show how such a scheme gives a universal relation for all black holes in Kerr-Newman family. We also discuss the effect on the mass gap in various interesting scenarios where the macroscopic construction goes towards becoming an extremal black hole. In [Section 4](#), we illustrate how the above results derived in the context of integer shift, translate into the physics of a Logarithmically discretized black hole. In [Section 5](#), we estimate the maximum number of quanta that a black hole can emit, through the smallest possible energy steps before it becomes Planck sized or extremal. Appealing to the emission time of release of a quanta we will calculate the time taken in the complete evaporation process of black hole as well. Furthermore, in [Section 6](#) we have discussed how the extremal limit of a black hole can be arrived at and will connect the classical results with the discretization schemes presented here. We finally argue the robustness of our results for higher dimensional black holes in [Section 7](#), before summarizing our main findings in [Section 8](#).

## 2 Holography and quantum spectrum of black holes

In this section we will concentrate on Kerr-Newman family of black holes, characterized by the mass  $M$ , angular momentum  $J$  and charge  $Q$ . Such a black hole in the context of general relativity corresponds to the Kerr-Newman solution. We will see that one can trivially translate all the results derived in this context to that of Kerr solution by setting  $Q = 0$ , while to that of Reissner-Nordström solution by setting  $J = 0$ . Further by simply taking the  $(Q, J) \rightarrow 0$  limit, one can arrive at the respective results derived for Schwarzschild spacetime. The horizon length scale will turn out to be an important parameter in the above problem, which for the Kerr-Newman black hole is (classically) located at,

$$r_h = M \left[ 1 + \sqrt{1 - \left\{ \left( \frac{a}{M} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{Q}{M} \right)^2 \right\}} \right]. \quad (1)$$

Here  $a = J/M$  is the rotation parameter associated with the Kerr-Newman black hole. Since we are interested in black hole spacetime, in what follows we will assume that  $(a^2 + Q^2) < M^2$ . Note that in the limit  $\{(a/M)^2 + (Q/M)^2\} \rightarrow 1$  the term inside square root vanishes and is known as the extremal limit. We will discuss various properties of the emission spectrum as a black hole approaches the extremal limit extensively below.

In this context of Kerr-Newman black hole we will assume that certain geometric feature, (e.g., area) gets discretized, without referring to any particular scheme of quantum gravity. In this approach we will

consider any classical black hole to be a macroscopic realization of the underlying quantum theory, which still awaits discovery. Remarkably enough, our results will be independent on the nitty gritty of such a quantum theory, except for the fact that some geometrical object has been discretized. Let such a geometrical construct, denoted by  $\mathcal{Z}$  is assumed to have a discrete spectral profile characterized by  $f(j)$ , where  $j$  symbolizes the quantum level, which, motivated by the compactness of the horizon we consider to be discrete. The particular form for  $f(j)$  will depend on the details of the discretization scheme, which we will not be bothered about and shall keep it arbitrary.

The classical geometry, which in the quantum theory of gravity will be given by some state  $\hat{\rho}$  and is understood to emerge in the macroscopic limit, when the expectation value of the geometric quantity  $\mathcal{Z}$  becomes

$$\mathcal{Z} = \text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}\hat{\mathcal{Z}}] = \alpha \sum_j n_j f(j) , \quad (2)$$

where the fluctuations are understood to be heavily suppressed for macroscopic size system. As mentioned earlier the discretization spectrum  $f(j)$  as of now will be arbitrary, which will be known only when the correct quantum theory of black holes becomes available. The parameter  $\alpha$  is a new scale which is brought along by the underlying quantum theory and is possibly related to the Planck scale. Further, the presence of a minimal Planck length in any theory of quantum gravity tells us that  $\mathcal{Z}$  must be bounded from below.

In the macroscopic limit let the area of the event horizon get related to this characterizing geometric parameter as

$$A = \kappa \mathcal{Z}^\gamma = \kappa \alpha^\gamma \left\{ \sum_j n_j f(j) \right\}^\gamma , \quad (3)$$

where  $\gamma$  is assumed to be some real positive number<sup>1</sup>. For example, when  $\mathcal{Z}$  corresponds to square root of black hole area, then  $\kappa = 1$  and  $\gamma = 2$ . If, we further accept that a macroscopic description emerging from the basic quantum theory should respect the Bekenstein's entropy-area relation, then there must also be a way to connect entropy with the quantum description, such that,

$$S = \frac{A}{4} = \frac{\bar{\alpha}^\gamma}{4} \left\{ \sum_j n_j f(j) \right\}^\gamma = \ln g(n) , \quad (4)$$

where  $\bar{\alpha}^\gamma = \kappa \alpha^\gamma$  and  $g(n)$  is effective number of micro states giving rise to the macroscopic black hole configuration, as we consider the black hole as a system in a micro-canonical set up. Many quantum gravity theories attempt to visualize this number of available microstates through their counting schemes and have been successful in doing so [12, 50, 51]. Therefore, recovery of this relation from microscopic counting does not really serve as a very strong discriminator between the available quantum gravity models. However, we will see (in Section 3) that characterizing the nearest allowed configuration may well be such a tool. Furthermore one can argue that this feature remains true in different ensemble pictures of analysis as well. From Eq.(4) it is simple to compute the number of micro states, leading to,

$$g(n) = \exp S = \exp \left( \frac{A}{4} \right) = \exp \left[ \frac{\bar{\alpha}^\gamma}{4} F^\gamma \right] ; \quad F \equiv \left\{ \sum_j n_j f(j) \right\} . \quad (5)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>We can generalize the relation of the area to the discretized variable in a polynomial fashion. Appendix A discusses the generalization.

The above relation provides the stringent constraints that the discretized levels must satisfy in order to maintain holography, i.e., the entropy-area relation. Clearly, as the number of microstates in the micro-canonical picture has to be an integer, for the right hand side of Eq.(5) to turn out to be an integer, one needs

$$\frac{\bar{\alpha}^\gamma}{4} F^\gamma = \ln K , \quad (6)$$

for some variable integer  $K$ , corresponding to different area values of the horizon. This can happen in two possible ways — (a)  $\bar{\alpha}^\gamma/4 = \ln I_0$  and  $F^\gamma = I$ , for all possible  $\{n_j\}$  (at least) for which  $\sum_j n_j \gg 1$ ; or (b) Either  $\bar{\alpha}^\gamma/4 = I_0$  for some fixed integer  $I_0$ , and  $F^\gamma = \ln I$  for variable integer  $I$ , i.e., in the macroscopic limit. The choice (a) essentially corresponds to a logarithmically discretized system while choice (b) presents a integer shift. A priori there seems to be no reason to prefer one above the other and thus we will discuss both of these scenarios. However it will turn out that the quantum spectrum of black holes heavily depend upon which of the above schemes have been chosen. We will first discuss the scenario depicted by case (a), i.e., in which

$$A = \beta I; \quad I \equiv F^\gamma = \text{Integer} . \quad (7)$$

Here  $\beta = \bar{\alpha}^\gamma$  carries the imprint of the underlying quantum structure and the integer  $I$  marks the micro states  $\{n_j\}$  in a collective manner. Such a integerly discretized scheme may be advocated on various grounds including quantum gravity as well [12, 14, 49, 52, 53]. As the black hole makes a transition from one macroscopic configuration characterized by  $\{n_j\}$  to another macroscopic state denoted by  $\{n'_j\}$  the integer changes from  $I$  to  $I'$ . We will be studying such transitions in the next section.

### 3 Minimum mass gap for black holes: Integer spectrum

In this section, we will assume the black hole to follow integer shift, i.e., its area is discretized, such that it follows Eq.(7). Further, if the macroscopic black hole of the quantum theory, closely resembles the classical black hole configuration, the area and the mass are related through,

$$\frac{\beta I}{4\pi} = r_h^2 + \{a^2 + Q^2\} = 2M^2 \left[ 1 + \sqrt{1 - \left\{ \left( \frac{a}{M} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{Q}{M} \right)^2 \right\}} \right] . \quad (8)$$

It is possible to invert the above relation in order to write down the mass in terms of the discretized area. This can be performed by completing the square on the right hand and then solving an algebraic equation for  $M$  in terms of  $(a, Q, I)$ . Such a relation can be written as,

$$\begin{aligned} 2M &= \frac{(\beta I/4\pi)}{\sqrt{(\beta I/4\pi) - (a^2 + Q^2)}} \\ &= \sqrt{(\beta I/4\pi) - (a^2 + Q^2)} + \frac{(a^2 + Q^2)}{\sqrt{(\beta I/4\pi) - (a^2 + Q^2)}} . \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

It is clear from the above expression that the macroscopic black hole's mass gets related to the integer  $I$  coming from the microscopic configuration counting. Different macroscopic configurations, identified with different  $I$  values, will therefore have different masses. We are interested in obtaining the smallest mass

difference between two (mass-wise) nearest black holes. In principle, the nearest neighbor of a black hole of mass  $M$  (and hence integer  $I$ ) can only be larger than the mass identified by the integer value  $I + 1$ . With this preamble, let us compute the mass shift as the black hole makes the smallest possible transition from  $I + 1$  to  $I$  keeping both  $Q$  and  $a$  same, or equivalently we are calculating the mass difference between two nearest micro-canonical configurations to be

$$\Delta M_{\min} = \frac{\beta}{16\pi} \frac{(\beta I/4\pi) - 2(a^2 + Q^2)}{\left\{ (\beta I/4\pi) - (a^2 + Q^2) \right\}^{3/2}}. \quad (10)$$

The above expression is not very illuminating. To cast the above relation to a more useful form we have to provide an expression for  $(\beta I/4\pi)$  in terms of the hairs of the black hole. Such a relation is being supplied by Eq.(8), yielding,

$$\frac{\beta I}{4\pi} - (a^2 + Q^2) = r_h^2 = \left[ M + \sqrt{M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2)} \right]^2, \quad (11)$$

as well as,

$$\frac{\beta I}{4\pi} - 2(a^2 + Q^2) = r_h^2 - (a^2 + Q^2) = 2r_h \sqrt{M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2)}. \quad (12)$$

Therefore, the substitution of both these expressions, namely Eq.(11) and Eq.(12) in the mass gap expression Eq.(10) leads us to the desired relation,

$$\Delta M_{\min} = \frac{\beta}{8\pi} \frac{\sqrt{M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2)}}{\left[ M + \sqrt{M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2)} \right]^2} = \frac{\beta}{2} \frac{T}{1 + \sqrt{1 - \eta^2}}. \quad (13)$$

Here  $T$  corresponds to the Hawking temperature associated with the Kerr-Newman black hole and  $\eta^2 = (a^2 + Q^2)/M^2$ , a dimensionless parameter approaching unity as the black hole approaches the extremal limit. It is sometimes beneficiary to write down the minimum mass gap in the following manner,

$$M \Delta M_{\min} = \frac{\beta}{8\pi} \frac{\sqrt{1 - \left\{ \left( \frac{a}{M} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{Q}{M} \right)^2 \right\}}}{\left[ 1 + \sqrt{1 - \left\{ \left( \frac{a}{M} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{Q}{M} \right)^2 \right\}} \right]^2}. \quad (14)$$

This is because the right hand side of the above relation is solely dependent on the specific charge  $Q/M$  and specific angular momentum  $a/M$ , which makes the extremal limit apparent (see, for example Fig. 1).

Thus, we have obtained an analytic expression for the (in principle) smallest mass gap and it gets related to the thermodynamic temperature of the black hole. If this mass gap gives rise to the emission of a quanta in the form of loss of energy, the frequency of the emitted quanta (ignoring the  $\beta/2$  factor), will always be less compared to the thermal frequency associated with black hole temperature. This is because the term  $1 + \sqrt{1 - \eta^2}$  is always greater than unity. Notably as,  $a = Q = 0$ , then  $\Delta M \sim 1/M$ , as it should for a macroscopic Schwarzschild black hole [38, 41, 46]. We would also like to point out that as the black hole approaches the classical extremal limit, i.e.,  $M \rightarrow (a^2 + Q^2)$ ,  $\Delta M \sim 0$ , remarkably the mass gap vanishes, leading to continuous quantum spectrum of emission, though at extremely small temperature.




Figure 1: The above figures depict how the minimum mass gap, expressed for convenience as  $M\Delta M$  changes as both the specific angular momentum ( $a/M$ ) and the specific charge ( $Q/M$ ) approaches unity. Both the figures clearly demonstrate that as the black hole approaches extremal limit the mass gap also tends to vanish. However initially, when ( $a/M$ ) (or,  $Q/M$ ) is far from unity, the minimum mass gap coincides with that of the Schwarzschild black hole, while for larger values the mass gap gradually decreases. Near the extremal region it shows a very steep decrease and then ultimately vanishes.

The last property is very unique for Kerr-Newman class of black holes and is absent in Schwarzschild black holes. The result clearly shows that near the extremal limit the quantum spectrum of a geometry discretized hole is almost continuous, unlike the Schwarzschild scenario. Thus the initial discreteness in the quantum spectrum of a Kerr-Newman black hole gradually makes its way to a continuous spectrum as the black hole approaches extremality. The above provides a curious generalization of Bekenstein-Mukhanov effect for rotating black hole, where the quantum spectrum can be almost continuous. This scenario has been demonstrated in Fig. 2.

It is also possible to estimate how fast does the mass gap between the nearest black holes in the configuration space, change as the rotation parameter  $a$  or the charge parameter  $Q$  is changed by simply differentiating Eq.(14) with respect to either  $a$  or  $Q$ . It turns out that  $\partial(M\Delta M_{\min})/\partial a$  as well as  $\partial(M\Delta M_{\min})/\partial Q$  attain a large negative value as one approaches the extremal limit. Therefore, we realize that the minimum mass gap  $\Delta M_{\min}$  quickly falls down as one approaches the extremal limit by using either  $a$  or  $Q$  (see Fig. 1). Thus the minimum mass gap derived above, brings out the characteristic signature of discretizing the underlying geometry. For a Schwarzschild black hole this bound coincides with the maxima of the thermal Hawking spectrum suggesting possible non-thermal nature which may have potential implication for the black hole information loss paradox [16, 20, 36, 38, 43, 44]. While for black holes in the Kerr-Newman class it turns out that in the near extremal limit this mass gap can become as small as one likes and hence the emission spectrum of black hole will become quasi-continuous. We will now see how this discontinuity in emission fares viz á viz the thermodynamic character of the black hole.

### 3.1 Thermodynamical consideration

If large black holes are to behave as thermodynamical objects, exactly as predicted by the classical black hole thermodynamics, the change in mass and change in angular momentum as presented above should be




Figure 2: The above figure schematically illustrates how the quantum spectrum gradually becomes continuous as the black hole approaches the extremal limit. Here both the axes are drawn in some arbitrary units. The blue, dot-dashed curve at the top illustrates the case of Schwarzschild black hole (i.e., with  $a = Q = 0$ ), from which it is clear that the spectrum will be largely discrete, as the minimum mass gap appears around the maxima of the distribution. While the red, dashed curve depicts the corresponding situation for  $a = Q = 0.35 M$  and the lowermost green curve illustrates the case with  $a = Q = 0.6 M$  respectively. As evident from the red and green curves, the region spanned by the quantum spectrum gradually increases as the  $(a/M)$  and  $(Q/M)$  increases. Ultimately when the black hole becomes near-extremal it will turn out that the quantum spectrum will become continuous.



following a trail prescribed by the thermodynamical laws. This is what we will demonstrate in this section. Let us consider the Kerr black hole with the understanding that the associated results can be generalized to a Kerr-Newman scenario in a straightforward manner. The first law of thermodynamics in the context of Kerr black hole relates a change in mass  $\delta M$  to a change in area  $\delta A$  and a change in rotation parameter  $\delta J$ , such that,

$$\delta M = \frac{\kappa}{8\pi} \delta A + \Omega_H \delta J; \quad \Omega_H = \frac{a}{2Mr_h} . \quad (15)$$

In the above expression  $\Omega_H$  corresponds to the angular velocity of the black hole event horizon. It is advantageous to write down the change in angular momentum as a change in mass and a change in rotation parameter  $a$ , where  $J = aM$ , leading to,  $\delta J = a\delta M + M\delta a$ . Thus one can express the change in rotation parameter as

$$\delta a = - \left( \frac{a}{M} \right) \delta M + \frac{\delta J}{M} . \quad (16)$$

For a macroscopic black hole the mass is supposed to be a large number, i.e.,  $M \gg 1$ , in dimensionless units, while  $J$  is supposed to change in integer steps if we were to invoke quantization of angular momentum. Hence the last term will have very little effect on  $\delta a$ . While for a black hole, which is far from being extremal one has  $a/M \ll 1$  and hence one can safely ignore the effect coming from  $\delta a$ . However near extremal limit of course effects of  $\delta a$  can not be neglected, unless the change in angular momentum and mass are related to each other such that:  $\delta J = a\delta M$ . This will definitely imply that the change in the rotation parameter is vanishing. Finally using the above results Eq.(15) can be transformed into a relation connection  $\delta M$ ,  $\delta A$  and  $\delta a$  respectively, such that,

$$\delta M = \frac{\delta A}{8\pi} \frac{\sqrt{M^2 - a^2}}{r_h^2} + \frac{aM}{r_h^2} \delta a . \quad (17)$$

In order to arrive at the above relation the following identity,  $1 - (a^2/2Mr_h) = r_h/2M$ , has been used. Further from Eq.(7) it follows that the minimum change in area corresponds to  $\beta$  as the black hole jumps from one macroscopic configuration to another such that  $I \rightarrow I + 1$ . Further, according to Eq.(17) it follows that the minimum mass gap will happen when  $\delta a = 0$  and area changes minimally. Note that in this case we are excluding two possibilities — (a) transition between degenerate levels, such that  $a$  changes but area does not change and (b) mass decreases while the rotation parameter increases. The second possibility will be problematic in the extremal limit as it may lead to formation of naked singularity which we would like to avoid. As these two scenarios are excluded and one uses the result that  $\delta A_{\min} = \beta$ , Eq.(13) is immediately retrieved.

Before concluding this discussion, let us briefly mention what happens to the mass gap in a more general scenario, in which both the mass and rotation parameter  $a$  change. This is because we normally expect a black hole to emit its multi-pole moments which apart from carrying energy will carry away some angular momentum as well. In this situation both area and rotation parameter change once the black hole makes a jump to the nearest allowed configuration. That immediately leads to the following most general expression for the mass gap,

$$\Delta M = \frac{\beta}{8\pi} \frac{\sqrt{M^2 - a^2}}{[M + \sqrt{M^2 - a^2}]^2} + \frac{Ma\Delta a}{[M + \sqrt{M^2 - a^2}]^2} . \quad (18)$$

Here we have used Eq.(17) with minimum change in area and expressing  $r_h$  in terms of the black hole parameters. As evident from the above relation, by setting  $\Delta a = 0$  we get back the original relation for the minimum mass gap derived in Eq.(13) (with  $Q = 0$ ). This explicitly shows that the mass gap due to quantum nature of underlying geometry does not betray black hole thermodynamics. Hence our initial assumption that black holes are macroscopic, behaving as a thermodynamic object holds good even when the geometry is discretized. Also note that for nonzero  $\Delta a$  the mass gap will be higher from the minimum value. In what follows we will concentrate on this characteristic minimum energy that a quantized (yet, macroscopic) black hole may emit and whether using this distinctive signature originating from the interface of quantum theory and gravity one can make any concrete astrophysical prediction.

### 3.2 A universal relation

In order to understand the behaviour of the mass gap, let us now introduce two more length scales in the problem — (a) the thermal de Broglie wavelength (for massless particles)  $\lambda_T \sim (1/T)$ , signifying the scale set by the thermality of the black hole and (b) the Compton wavelength  $\lambda_c \sim r_h$  [47, 54, 55], where  $r_h$  is the location of the event horizon, marking the *size* of the black hole. The smallest mass difference  $\Delta M_{\min}$  corresponds to a minimum emission frequency and hence to a maximum emission wavelength  $\lambda_{\max}$ . Thus given Eq.(13) the maximum wavelength takes the following form,

$$\lambda_{\max} = \left( \frac{8\pi}{\beta} \right) \frac{\left( M + \sqrt{M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2)} \right)^2}{\sqrt{M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2)}}. \quad (19)$$

Here we have again gone back to the Kerr-Newman black hole. On the other hand, the thermal wavelength  $\lambda_T$  and the Compton wavelength  $\lambda_c$  for Kerr-Newman black hole take the following form,

$$\lambda_T = \frac{4\pi M \left( M + \sqrt{M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2)} \right)}{\sqrt{M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2)}}, \quad (20)$$

$$\lambda_c = M + \sqrt{M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2)}. \quad (21)$$

It is possible to express the largest emission wavelength  $\lambda_{\max}$  in terms of both  $\lambda_T$  and  $\lambda_c$  individually, i.e.,

$$\lambda_{\max} = \left( \frac{8\pi}{\beta} \right) \left( \frac{\lambda_T}{4\pi} \right) \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{\left( \frac{\lambda_T}{4\pi} \right) \frac{1}{M} - 1} \right], \quad (22)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_{\max}} = \frac{\beta}{8\pi} \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_c} - \frac{M}{\lambda_c^2} \right). \quad (23)$$

Hence, we readily obtain that in the near-extremal limit,  $(a^2 + Q^2) \rightarrow M^2$ , such that  $\lambda_{\max} \sim \lambda_T$ , but *not* as  $\lambda_c$  i.e., for nearly extremal black holes the maximum wavelength (or, minimum frequency) scales with the thermal wavelength but *not* the Compton wavelength. Thus even though potentially a black hole is capable of housing both the thermal and Compton wavelength, the minimum frequency gets related to the thermal wavelength. Since the minimum emission frequency is intimately connected to the quasi-normal mode frequency of a black hole [56–58], the above observation remarkably suggests that in the near extremal

limit, the minimum quasi-normal mode frequency of a black hole, has nothing to do with its size (which is  $\sim M$ ) but with the thermal scale (which scales as  $\sim \sqrt{M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2)}$ )! Moreover, interestingly, it is possible to combine all the three length scales in a convenient manner to obtain,

$$\lambda_{\max} = \left( \frac{8\pi}{\beta} \right) \frac{\lambda_c \lambda_T}{4\pi M} . \quad (24)$$

This expression relates the three distinct length scales of a black hole through its mass. Note that in the limit of vanishing charge and rotation, the thermal and the Compton wavelength both scale proportional to the black hole mass, such that the maximum wavelength for Schwarzschild black hole becomes  $\lambda_{\max, \text{sch}} = (8\pi/\beta)4M$ . Therefore, using the maximum wavelength for Schwarzschild, one readily arrives at the following dimensionless ratio,

$$\frac{\lambda_{\max}}{\lambda_{\max, \text{sch}}} = \frac{\lambda_c \lambda_T}{16\pi M^2} . \quad (25)$$

Since the maximum wavelength  $\lambda_{\max}$  dictates whether the quantum spectrum of a black hole is dense or not (see Fig. 2 for a related discussion), the above relation is a measure of the denseness of the emission spectral profile of a Kerr black hole viz-a-viz its Schwarzschild counterpart. One can actually determine an universal constant, i.e., independent of the nature of black hole hairs, out of the above length scales. This can be achieved by noting that  $\lambda_{c, \text{sch}} = 2M$  and  $\lambda_{T, \text{sch}} = 8\pi M$ , thus we obtain,

$$\frac{\lambda_{\max}}{\lambda_c \lambda_T} = \frac{\lambda_{\max, \text{sch}}}{\lambda_{c, \text{sch}} \lambda_{T, \text{sch}}} . \quad (26)$$

Therefore, the ratio  $\lambda_{\max}/(\lambda_c \lambda_T)$  gives an universal constant containing fundamental constants from different branches of physics, ranging from thermodynamical to the Planck scale, of the integer shift scheme and *is independent of whether the black hole is Kerr-Newman or Schwarzschild!* Further, this tri-ratio of infrared physics cooks up an ultra-violet invariant of the theory of the black holes. Since this gives the parameter strength of the underlying quantum theory of black holes, it is an observationally realizable infrared test on the models of quantum gravity, which, from observational perspective, is much more feasible. When compared to using sub-leading corrections to the area-entropy relation [59–61], this tri-ratio is much more favorable to decide in favor of a theory observationally. This shows that there may exist an astrophysical avenue to test the discretization scheme of black holes. Measurement of  $\lambda_c$  for a black hole will be feasible in near future as the Einstein telescope starts operating [62] as it can determine the photon radius of the black hole to sufficient accuracy. While measurement of  $\lambda_T$  and  $\lambda_{\max}$  is not going to happen for a real black hole in foreseeable future, but it is indeed possible for analogue systems. There one can simply check whether such a universality of the relation exists and then it can directly tell us about the underlying quantum structure without having to probe “quantum gravity”.

## 4 The situation with Logarithmic spectrum

As we have pointed out in Section 2, the area of the black hole besides being discretized in integer steps, can also change under a different shift scheme, while remaining faithful to the entropy-area relation. This corresponds to the Logarithmic discretization of the area, i.e.,  $A = \bar{\beta} \ln I$ , where  $I$  is a variable integer constructed using occupancy of various quantum levels of the macroscopic black hole and  $\bar{\beta}$  is a constant of discretization. Though this shift scheme becomes hugely disfavored if the area and the discretized variable

are not related in a straightforward manner as depicted in Eq.(3) (see Appendix A and Appendix B as well as Section 6), we discuss the implicit features of this scheme for completeness. In this case, the minimum mass shift corresponds to a shift in the quantum levels of a black hole such that  $(I + 1) \rightarrow I$ . The area for a Kerr-Newman black hole has been already written in Eq.(8), in terms of the black hole mass  $M$ , the rotation parameter  $a$  and the charge  $Q$ . This relation can be inverted to obtain the mass of the black hole as a function of the area of the horizon and the charge and rotation parameter, leading to,

$$M = \frac{A}{8\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(A/4\pi) - (a^2 + Q^2)}}. \quad (27)$$

The area being Logarithmically discretized, using the above relation one can write down the mass associated with the set of quantum numbers  $\{n_j\}$  which collectively corresponds to the integer  $I$  as,

$$2M = \frac{\bar{\beta}}{4\pi} \frac{\ln I}{\sqrt{(\bar{\beta}/4\pi) \ln I - (a^2 + Q^2)}}. \quad (28)$$

In this case as well, the change in mass will be effected by a change in the horizon area, as well as a change in the rotation parameter and charge. However when the black hole is far from being extremal one can neglect the change in rotation parameter and the charge respectively. Moreover if we assume that if the mass of a black hole decreases, both the rotation parameter and the charge also decrease (to avoid formation of naked singularity), then the minimum mass gap will correspond to  $\Delta a = 0 = \Delta Q$ . Hence the minimum change in the black hole mass will be due to a shift in the quantum levels as the black hole makes a transition from the state  $I + 1$  to another state  $I$ , resulting into,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\Delta M_{\min, \log} &= \left[ \left\{ \frac{\bar{\beta}}{4\pi} \ln(1 + I) - (a^2 + Q^2) \right\}^{1/2} - \left\{ \frac{\bar{\beta}}{4\pi} \ln I - (a^2 + Q^2) \right\}^{1/2} \right] \\ &\quad - a^2 \left[ \left\{ \frac{\bar{\beta}}{4\pi} \ln(1 + I) - (a^2 + Q^2) \right\}^{-1/2} - \left\{ \frac{\bar{\beta}}{4\pi} \ln I - (a^2 + Q^2) \right\}^{-1/2} \right] \\ &= \frac{\bar{\beta}}{4\pi} \frac{\sqrt{M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2)}}{\left( M + \sqrt{M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2)} \right)^2} \exp \left[ -\frac{A}{\bar{\beta}} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

In order to arrive at the above relation we have used the following result:  $\ln(1 + I) = \ln I + \ln(1 + 1/I)$ , which for large values of  $I$  can be written as  $\ln I + (1/I)$ . We have denoted the minimum mass change by  $\Delta M_{\min, \log}$ , to distinguish with the minimum mass gap  $\Delta M_{\min}$  appearing in the earlier calculation pertaining integer shift.

Note that for Schwarzschild spacetime (i.e., with  $a = 0 = Q$ ) the minimum mass change corresponds to  $\sim (1/M) \exp(-M^2)$ . Thus unlike the integer shift, in this case the black hole spectrum will be practically continuous. Hence if one requires — (a) continuous Hawking spectrum, (b) entropy to be proportional to the area, then the black hole *must* be Logarithmically discretized. The same consideration applies to the rotating black holes as well. In this case as evident from Eq.(13),  $\Delta M_{\min, \log} \propto \Delta M_{\min} \exp(-A)$ . Since the area of the black hole is still a macroscopic quantity, it immediately follows that there is a huge suppression of  $\exp(-A)$  in the Logarithmically discretized spectrum when compared to the integer shift.

Further, defining  $\eta^2 = (a^2 + Q^2)/M$ , the above minimum mass change can be written in the following

suggestive form,

$$\begin{aligned}
M\Delta M_{\min,\log} &= \frac{\bar{\beta}}{8\pi} \frac{\sqrt{1-\eta^2}}{(1+\sqrt{1-\eta^2})^2} \exp\left(-\frac{8\pi M^2}{\bar{\beta}}\{1+\sqrt{1-\eta^2}\}\right) \\
&= M\Delta M_{\min} \exp\left(-\frac{8\pi M^2}{\bar{\beta}}\{1+\sqrt{1-\eta^2}\}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

It is interesting to see a comparison between the minimum mass gap  $\Delta M_{\min,\log}$  defined using Logarithmic discretization and the minimum mass gap  $\Delta M_{\min}$  associated with integer shift. First of all, the magnitude of  $\Delta M_{\min,\log}$  will be much less compared to  $\Delta M_{\min}$ , due to the exponential suppression. Moreover, note that the quantity  $M\Delta M_{\min}$  has no dependence on black hole mass, it merely depends on the parameter  $\eta$ . While  $M\Delta M_{\min,\log}$  has explicit dependence on  $M$ . Further since the term within the exponential is always positive, the minimum mass gap for the Logarithmic discretization will always be smaller compared to integer shift. The other distinct feature corresponds to existence of a maxima for  $M\Delta M_{\min,\log}$  for a give choice of  $\eta$  (as evident from Fig. 3). One can determine the same by setting  $\partial(M\Delta M_{\min,\log})/\partial\eta = 0$ , leading to,

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ - \left\{ \left( \frac{\bar{\beta}}{8\pi M^2} \right)^2 + 4 \left( \frac{\bar{\beta}}{8\pi M^2} \right) - 1 \right\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sqrt{\left( \frac{\bar{\beta}}{8\pi M^2} \right)^4 + 8 \left( \frac{\bar{\beta}}{8\pi M^2} \right)^3 + 14 \left( \frac{\bar{\beta}}{8\pi M^2} \right)^2 + 8 \left( \frac{\bar{\beta}}{8\pi M^2} \right) + 1} \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

One can check that for this value of  $\eta^2$  the second derivative term, i.e.,  $\partial^2(M\Delta M_{\min,\log})/\partial\eta^2$  will turn out to be negative (see Fig. 3). For example, if one sets the black hole mass such that  $(\bar{\beta}/8\pi M^2) = 1$ , then one would obtain:  $\eta^2 = (1/2)(\sqrt{20} - 2)$ . *This refers to the cross over between the contrasting Schwarzschild or Kerr-Newman family of black holes viz-a-viz temperature evolution during evaporation.* Thus as  $\eta$  increases the minimum frequency also increases at first, ultimately reaching a maximum value (still small compared to the minimum energy of the quanta in the integer shift scheme) and then goes to zero as  $\eta \rightarrow 1$ . Thus in both the discretization schemes the discrete quantum spectrum of a black hole becomes continuous as the extremal limit is being approached.

At this stage it is worthwhile to ask whether there exist any universal relation pertaining to this discretization scheme as well. To our surprise, it turns out that there is indeed a universal relation (i.e., independent of whether it is a Schwarzschild black hole or a Kerr-Newman black hole) when the black hole is discretized in a Logarithmic manner. Expressions for the thermal wavelength and the Compton wavelength associated with the Kerr-Newman black hole has already been provided in the previous section, in particular see Eq.(20) and Eq.(21) respectively. These wavelengths are independent of the discretization scheme. On the other hand, the minimum frequency or, equivalently the maximum wavelength associated with  $\Delta M_{\min,\log}$  corresponds to

$$\lambda_{\max,\log} = \frac{8\pi}{\bar{\beta}} \frac{\left(M + \sqrt{M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2)}\right)^2}{\sqrt{M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2)}} \exp\left[\frac{8\pi}{\bar{\beta}} M \left(M + \sqrt{M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2)}\right)\right] \tag{32}$$

Adopting the procedure employed in Section 3.2 it immediately follows that one can construct the following




Figure 3: The above figure depicts the behaviour of the minimum mass gap with  $\eta = \sqrt{(a^2 + Q^2)}/M^2$ . The upper curve (blue, thick) represents the minimum mass gap for integer shift, while the below one (red, dashed) provides the minimum mass gap when the Logarithmic discretization scheme is being used. It is clear that as the extremal limit is approached, i.e.,  $\eta \rightarrow 1$  both of them vanishes, while for  $\eta \neq 1$  the minimum mass gap of the Logarithmically discretized black hole is always smaller compared to the integer discretized scenario. This is in complete agreement with our analytical results as well. Further, the graph in the inset provides a zoomed in version of the  $M\Delta M_{\min, \log}$  illustrating the existence of a maxima in conformity with our results.

combination

$$\frac{\lambda_{\max,\log}}{\lambda_{\max,\text{sch}}} = \frac{\lambda_c \lambda_T}{16\pi M^2} \exp \left[ \frac{8\pi M}{\alpha} (\lambda_c - \lambda_{c,\text{sch}}) \right] \quad (33)$$

At this stage as well the difference with [Eq.\(25\)](#) in the context of integer shift should be immediate. As the minimum frequency is suppressed by the exponential factor, the maximum wavelength will be enhanced by the exponential factor in comparison to the integer shift scheme. Thus taking a cue from [Section 3.2](#), in this case as well one can have the following universal relation independent of the nature of the black hole,

$$\frac{\lambda_{\max,\log}}{\lambda_c \lambda_T} \exp \left[ -\frac{\lambda_{T,\text{sch}}}{\beta} \lambda_c \right] = \frac{\lambda_{\max,\log,\text{sch}}}{\lambda_{c,\text{sch}} \lambda_{T,\text{sch}}} \exp \left[ -\frac{\lambda_{T,\text{sch}}}{\beta} \lambda_{c,\text{sch}} \right] . \quad (34)$$

In this case well note that the left hand side corresponds to the expressions for wavelengths in a Kerr-Newman background, while those on the right hand side depicts identical quantities for a Schwarzschild background. This suggests, that the quantity on the left hand side has the same value irrespective of the hairs of the black hole and hence will act as a universal feature of this discretization scheme.

Having described both the discretization schemes in some detail and the associated universal relations, as well as their compatibility with macroscopic thermodynamical laws we will now concentrate on their possible implications and generalizations. These will involve an estimate of the lifetime of a black hole as well as the maximum number of quanta that a black hole can emit. We will also explore the extremal limit of a black hole in light of the discretization scheme. Finally we will try to explore other alternative scenarios, e.g., the changes brought about by alternative gravity theories as well as by higher dimensions.

## 5 How long can the black hole live?

We have obtained the expression for the smallest frequency to be emitted from a black hole as long as the mass of the black hole is large compared to the Planck mass. Therefore, in principle, we can follow the footprints of black hole emission obtained in this work, till the time it turns into a Planck mass object, where the approximation of large mass, would no longer remain applicable. Therefore, through these calculations, we could in principle evaluate how many quanta a black hole could radiate before it settles into such a Planck mass system.

### 5.1 Number of emitted quanta

In order to obtain an upper bound on the number of emitted quanta, we will assume that throughout its evaporation the mass change brought about in the hole is only through the minimum mass change at each step. Thus difference between the initial  $I_i$  (which signifies the starting hole mass) and the final  $I_f$  (signifying the Planck mass hole) should yield the number of quanta emitted. Let the initial mass be  $M_i$ , angular momentum and charge being  $a_i$ ,  $Q_i$  respectively. Similarly for the final state we have  $a_f$ ,  $Q_f$  representing charge and angular momentum respectively and  $M_f$  being the final mass. Let  $\eta^2 = (a^2 + Q^2)/M^2$ , then for initial and final state we immediately obtain,

$$\frac{\beta}{4\pi} I_i = 2M_i^2 \left[ 1 + \sqrt{1 - \eta_i^2} \right] , \quad (35)$$

$$\frac{\beta}{4\pi} I_f = 2M_f^2 \left[ 1 + \sqrt{1 - \eta_f^2} \right] . \quad (36)$$




Figure 4: The above figures illustrate how the number of emitted quanta changes as both  $\mu = M_f/M_i$  and  $\eta_i$  are being modified for a black hole with  $\eta_f = 1$ . The plot on the left panel corresponds to the integer discretized scenario, while the plot on the right depicts a black hole discretized in a Logarithmic manner. Both the figures clearly demonstrate that as the black hole approaches extremal limit the number of emitted quanta increases. However the number of emitted quanta in the case of integer shift is much smaller compared to the case of Logarithmic discretization of black hole. The color shading in the contour plots represent the number of emitted quanta in some arbitrary units.



Introducing the final black hole mass a fraction of the initial mass  $M_f = \mu M_i$ , we obtain the (largest) number of emitted quanta for the process  $M_i \rightarrow M_f$ , for the integer discretized black hole as,

$$N_{\text{if}} = \frac{8\pi}{\beta} M_i^2 \left[ (1 - \mu^2) + \left( \sqrt{1 - \eta_i^2} - \mu^2 \sqrt{1 - \eta_f^2} \right) \right]. \quad (37)$$

In general if a macroscopic black hole emits thermal radiation as prescribed by semiclassical physics [7, 63, 64], then the quanta emission for a Kerr black hole will go on till it either becomes extremal or Planck sized. At the extremal limit, the temperature of the black hole becomes vanishingly small and hence the minimum energy will also go to zero (see Fig. 1). In such a scenario, if the final state of the hole turns out to be extremal, then,  $\eta_f = 1$ , hence the number of quanta emitted would be given by,

$$N_{\text{extremal}} = \frac{8\pi}{\beta} M_i^2 \left[ (1 - \mu^2) + \sqrt{1 - \eta_i^2} \right]. \quad (38)$$

With the end state being an extremal black hole, the maximum number of emitted quanta would correspond to the situation when besides being extremal the final black hole also turns out to be Planck sized, such that  $\mu \rightarrow 0$ , in which case the maximum number of quanta would be,

$$N_{\text{extremal}}^{\text{max}} \simeq \frac{8\pi}{\beta} M_i^2 \left[ 1 + \sqrt{1 - \eta_i^2} \right] = I_i. \quad (39)$$

While the minimum number of emitted quanta for the extremal case would correspond to the case  $\mu \sim 1$ , i.e., the black hole becomes extremal very quickly much before reaching the Planck size and hence,

$$N_{\text{extremal}}^{\text{min}} = \frac{8\pi}{\beta} M_i^2 \sqrt{1 - \eta_i^2}. \quad (40)$$

Further it will be useful to ensure that, the black hole, by emission of these quanta, is indeed going towards extremality. This can be done by imposing the condition that the  $(a, Q)$  sector and black hole mass  $M$  are changing in such a manner that  $\eta_f > \eta_i$ . For example, if  $(a_f^2 + Q_f^2) > (a_i^2 + Q_i^2)$ , while  $M_f < M_i$  then the above criteria will be trivially satisfied. Also, note that for  $\eta_f > \eta_i$ , it follows that  $(1 - \eta_f^2) < (1 - \eta_i^2)$  and hence, we arrive at, the inequality,  $(I_f/I_i) < \mu^2$ . Since the black hole is supposed to decay to lower and lower  $I$  values, the above condition ensures that it will certainly be driven to extremality.

The corresponding computation of the number of emitted quanta will follow an identical pathway in the context of Logarithmic discretization as well. The only change will be, in this case  $\beta I$  will be replaced by  $\bar{\beta} \ln I$ , such that the number of emitted quanta will be

$$N_{\text{if,log}} = I_i - I_f = \exp \left[ \frac{8\pi}{\bar{\beta}} M_f^2 \left( 1 + \sqrt{1 - \eta_f^2} \right) \right] \{ \exp(N_{\text{if}}) - 1 \}, \quad (41)$$

where  $N_{\text{if}}$  corresponds to the number of emitted quanta in the case of integer shift. Thus it is clear that (and expected as well) in the case of a black hole discretized in a Logarithmic fashion the number of emitted quanta will be exponentially large for a given change in its macroscopic parameters. Hence in contrast to the integer discretized scenario an exponentially large number of quanta will be emitted from a Logarithmically discretized black hole (see Fig. 4).

Thus given the initial mass and the final mass, along with the charge and rotation parameters it is possible to obtain the maximum number of quanta a black hole could emit. Depending upon the spin  $S$




Figure 5: The above figure depicts the behaviour of the characteristic time scale  $\tau$  with  $\eta$  in the units of inverse mass. The upper curve (red, thick) represents the behaviour of the time scale for integer shift, while the below one (blue, dashed) provides the associated time scale when the Logarithmic discretization scheme is being used. It is clear that as the extremal limit is approached, i.e.,  $\eta \rightarrow 1$  both of them diverges, as anticipated. while for  $\eta \neq 1$  the time scale associated with the Logarithmically discretized black hole is always smaller compared to the integer discretized scenario. This is in complete agreement with our analytical results.

of the emitted quanta, we can associate the dimensionality  $(2\mathcal{S} + 1)^N$  to the emitted radiation's Hilbert space quantum theoretically. Since the characteristic emission time for a quanta is related to the frequency it is emitted at, we can calculate, dynamically how long a black hole will last before it emits the quanta to turn into a Planck star or a extremal remnant. We can visualize the black hole emissions as jumps within macroscopically distinguishable configurations which must be microscopically orthogonal too. In that case we can also find out the fastest time in which a black hole can vanish [65]. This will also give the fastest route for a black hole to emit all its information. This exercise we leave for a future computation.

## 5.2 Lifetime of a black hole

Another very much observable aspect of this analysis is the computation *the maximum possible lifetime* of a black hole. As in the previous section, here also we will assume that all the emitted quanta have the minimum energy  $\omega_{\min}$ , so that one can introduce a characteristic time scale  $\tau$ , identical for all the emitted quanta. A natural way to determine the time scale  $\tau$  is through the following equation for the mass loss rate [46]

$$\frac{dM}{dt} = -\frac{2\omega_{\min}}{\tau}. \quad (42)$$

At this stage one assumes some form for the mass loss rate and hence determine  $\tau$ . Subsequently this time scale is coupled to the number of emitted quanta, leading to an estimation of the lifetime of a black hole. Since we are considering only the minimum energy quanta, it immediately follows that the time period computed here will provide an upper bound to the lifetime of a black hole.

To proceed further it is natural to assume that the above mass loss is due to thermal emission. From which it is possible to determine the mass loss rate in terms of the area and the temperature of the Kerr-Newman black hole as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dM}{dt} &= - \left( \frac{2\pi^2}{120} \right) (\text{Area}) T^4 \\ &= \left( -\frac{1}{1920\pi} \right) \frac{[M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2)]^2}{M^3 \left( M + \sqrt{M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2)} \right)^3}, \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

where we have used expressions for the horizon area  $A$  and the black hole temperature  $T$  in term of the black hole parameters  $(M, a, Q)$ . Note that the minus sign in front of Eq.(43) ensures that the mass decreases with time. Finally equating Eq.(43) with the right hand side of Eq.(42), we obtain the characteristic time scale  $\tau$  of emission of a minimum energy quanta to be,

$$\tau = 480\beta M^3 \frac{\left( M + \sqrt{M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2)} \right)}{\left\{ M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2) \right\}^{3/2}}. \quad (44)$$

Note that in the case of Schwarzschild black hole (i.e., with  $a = 0 = Q$ ) the time scale becomes proportional to  $M$  [46], while in the extremal limit, obtained by taking  $a^2 + Q^2 \rightarrow M^2$ ,  $\tau$  diverges. This suggests that in the near extremal region it takes a large time to emit the minimum energy quanta. This is expected as in the extremal limit the temperature of the black hole vanishes. The total lifetime of a black hole can be obtained by multiplying the average time scale  $\tau$  with the total number of emitted quanta. In principle it should be obtained by integrating over the total time period of the black hole and since  $\tau$  diverges, it takes an infinite time to reach the extremal limit. However as a crude estimate we can take the number of emitted quanta to be  $\sim M^2$  and if the black hole is far from being extremal, then total lifetime of a black hole will be  $\sim M^3$ , which is certainly large.

The above computation was for a integerly evolving black hole, while for a Logarithmic discretization scheme the minimum frequency will be different and hence the associated time scale will become

$$\tau_{\log} = 480\beta M^3 \frac{\left( M + \sqrt{M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2)} \right)}{\left\{ M^2 - (a^2 + Q^2) \right\}^{3/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{A}{\beta}\right) = \tau \exp\left(-\frac{A}{\beta}\right), \quad (45)$$

where  $\tau$  is defined in Eq.(44). Note that the associated time scale is exponentially small compared to the corresponding integer discretized scenario. Still the divergence of  $\tau_{\log}$  in the extremal limit remains due to the  $\tau$  factor in its front (see Fig. 5). Thus in this case as well the total time to reach the extremal limit will be infinite. However if we consider the final state to be far from extremality, then it will follow that, the total lifetime of a black hole to be  $\sim M^3 \exp(M^2)$ , which again is exponentially large compared to the integer spacing scenario. The feasibility of either of these schemes for an isolated primordial black hole survivability is an interesting point to dwell upon, which we defer for future.

## 6 Extremal limit of a black hole

In this section we would like to show that a few results derived in the context of extremal limit of a macroscopic black hole also hold even when the black hole is assumed to have discrete structure. In the context of macroscopic physics it has been demonstrated that, if one throws a charged particle inside a Kerr (or, Kerr-Newman) black hole then one can gradually arrive at an extremal black hole. We would like to show that the same is true for our case as well, i.e., if we consider the black hole characterized by mass  $M$  and angular momentum  $J \equiv Ma$  to transform into another black hole with parameters  $(\bar{M}, \bar{J})$  by jumping down the discrete geometry spectrum, it actually evolves to an extremal configuration. We further assume that the rotating black hole emits a quanta with the minimum energy  $\omega_{\min}$  with respect to the asymptotic observers, such that its mass change of the black hole corresponds to  $\Delta M = \omega_{\min}$  and the change in angular momentum being  $\Delta J = (J/M)\Delta M$ , such that  $\delta a \equiv \delta(J/M) = 0$ . Then one can construct the following dimensionless quantity,

$$\Theta(M, a) = \frac{T_{\text{new}} - T_{\text{old}}}{T_{\text{old}}} , \quad (46)$$

where,  $T_{\text{old}}$  corresponds to a rotating black hole with parameters  $(M, J)$ , while  $T_{\text{new}}$  relates to the black hole with  $(M - \Delta M, J - \Delta J)$ . Assuming  $\Delta M \ll M$ , we have the dimensionless ratio  $\Theta$  taking the following form,

$$\Theta(M, a) = \frac{M\Delta M}{M^2 - a^2} \left[ \sqrt{1 - \xi^2} - \xi^2 \right] ; \quad \xi = \frac{a}{M} . \quad (47)$$

Thus note that for  $\xi \geq 0.79$  (which is a solution of the algebraic equation  $\xi^4 + \xi^2 - 1 = 0$ ), the dimensionless quantity  $\Theta < 0$  [66]. Hence as the black hole emits the minimum quanta the  $\xi$  gradually increases and one will eventually end up with a higher negative value of the  $\Theta$  parameter. This suggests that one arrives at the extremal limit as the black hole loses mass gradually by jumping into lower quantum states. An interesting fact with the above expression is that for  $\xi < 0.79$ , the temperature associated with the new black hole is actually greater than the temperature of the old black hole, which is the signal of domination of Schwarzschild character again.

Let us now briefly mention how to connect this up with the physical process of lowering a charged particle gradually into a Kerr black hole. If one considers a situation where a particle of mass  $\mu$  and charge  $q$  is being dropped slowly into a Kerr black hole. We will assume that this will make the black hole to emit  $n$  quanta, such that it jumps from initial configuration  $J \rightarrow J - n$  while the angular momentum  $J$  is unaltered. Thus the original black hole with mass  $M$  and rotation parameter  $a = J/M$  becomes another black hole with mass  $M + \mathcal{E}$  and rotation parameter  $J/(M + \mathcal{E})$ . Here  $\mathcal{E}$  corresponds to the energy contributed by the charged object. Then from Eq.(8) we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\beta n}{4\pi} &= 2(M + \mathcal{E}) \left[ (M + \mathcal{E}) + \sqrt{(M + \mathcal{E})^2 - \frac{J^2}{(M + \mathcal{E})^2} - q^2} \right] - 2M \left[ M + \sqrt{M^2 - \frac{J^2}{M^2}} \right] \\ &= -\frac{Mq^2}{\sqrt{M^2 - a^2}} + 2\mathcal{E} \left[ M + \sqrt{M^2 - a^2} \right] \left[ 1 + \frac{M}{M + \sqrt{M^2 - a^2}} + \frac{M^2 + a^2}{\sqrt{M^2 - a^2} [M + \sqrt{M^2 - a^2}]} \right] . \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

The above expression must remain finite in the extremal limit as well, since we would like to impose the condition that if the initial black hole is extremal then the final black hole should also remain extremal at

most (i.e., does not become a naked singularity). Thus the requirement of divergent terms in the above expression in the extremal limit forces the energy associated with the charged particle to be

$$\mathcal{E} = \frac{q^2}{4M} . \quad (49)$$

Incidentally, this exactly coincides with the universal minimum energy that can be supplied by a charged body and is also the energy supplied in extremal situation by a charged particle [66]. This result was derived earlier using the classical black hole picture, while here we have merely computed the change in the energy levels due to lowering of this charged particle in the black hole. Note that if the particle had no charge, i.e., if  $q = 0$  then the above expression will require  $\mathcal{E}$  to identically vanish. Further using the above expression for  $\mathcal{E}$ , in the extremal limit we obtain,

$$\frac{\beta n}{4\pi} = \frac{\Delta A}{4\pi} = q^2 . \quad (50)$$

Thus remarkably, the change of area and hence the number of emitted quanta is characterized by the charge of the particle in the extremal limit. Further from Eq.(50) it immediately follows that the charge has to be quantized and the shift in the black hole quantum levels is square of the number of charge quanta present within the charged body. This directly relates the discrete spectrum of black holes to the quantization of the charge. Hence the black hole indeed approaches to the extremal limit and the classical universal features associated with near the extremal black holes are borne out by our quantum schemes as well.

As an aside note that for a Logarithmically discretized black hole, the above condition would relate  $q^2$  with  $\ln |J/(J - n)|$ , where we have assumed that the initial state is denoted by  $J$  and the black hole jumps in  $n$  discrete steps. Thus note that in this case it will be difficult to relate the discretization of black hole spectrum with the quantization of charge. From this perspective, discretization of black hole area in integer steps is more preferred.

## 7 Generalization to Higher Dimensional Black Holes

So far, our discussion was concentrated on Kerr-Newman solution in four spacetime dimensions alone. In this setting we have observed that in the extremal limit the black hole emission spectra becomes almost continuous. We can similarly ask if the characteristic features of a rotating black hole are retained in higher dimensions.

Let us start by considering Kerr black hole in higher dimensions, characterized with a single rotation parameter  $a$  [67–71]. In  $D$  spacetime dimensions the horizon of such a rotating black hole is located at  $r = r_h$ , where  $r_h$  is a solution of the following algebraic equation,

$$r^2 + a^2 - Mr^{5-D} = 0 . \quad (51)$$

In general obtaining a solution for  $r_h$  for arbitrary  $D$  is difficult, so we will consider only the case  $D = 5$ . For a five dimensional spacetime the above algebraic equation can be readily solved resulting into the following horizon location:  $r_h = \sqrt{M - a^2}$ . Note that in this case the extremal limit is defined as  $M \rightarrow a^2$ . The area of the event horizon for the rotating black hole in five dimensions can be easily computed, resulting into  $A = 2\pi^2 r_h (r_h^2 + a^2)$ . Thus if the black hole is discretized in integer steps (see Section 2) then the following relation can be obtained,

$$\frac{\beta I}{2\pi^2} = M \sqrt{M - a^2} . \quad (52)$$

We can compute the minimum mass change for the higher dimensional solution following exactly an identical procedure as in [Section 3](#). In particular we keep the rotation parameter  $a$  fixed and then consider the mass change as the integer  $I$  drops to  $(I - 1)$ . This results into the following expression for minimum mass change,

$$\Delta M_{\min} = \frac{\beta}{\pi^2} \frac{\sqrt{M^2 - a^2}}{3M - 2a^2} . \quad (53)$$

Thus again the mass change vanishes in the extremal limit, which corresponds to  $M = a^2$ . Thus our conclusion remains unchanged as we consider a higher dimensional rotating solution. One can trivially verify that the same conclusion holds for Logarithmic discretization as well.

For completeness let us consider a charged black hole in five dimensions. One can immediately compute the location of the event horizon by setting  $g^{rr} = 0$ . This in turn implies that the horizon location can be obtained by solving the following algebraic equation,  $r^4 - 2Mr^2 + Q^2 = 0$ . The corresponding solution for the event horizon becomes

$$r_h^2 = M + \sqrt{M^2 - Q^2} . \quad (54)$$

Here  $M \rightarrow Q$  corresponds to the extremal limit. In this context except for some numerical factors, the horizon area is being given by  $A \sim r_h^3$ , such that for integer shift, the above area-mass relation reduces to,

$$\alpha^{2/3} I^{2/3} = M + \sqrt{M^2 - Q^2} , \quad (55)$$

where  $\alpha$  is essentially proportional to  $\beta$  with some additional numerical factors. One can in principle invert the above relation and obtain the mass in terms of the integer  $I$ . Then again considering the transition of the black hole from  $I$  to  $I - 1$ , the minimum mass separation can be immediately obtained as,

$$\Delta M = -\frac{\alpha Q^2}{3} \left[ M + \sqrt{M^2 - Q^2} \right]^{-5/2} + \frac{\alpha}{3} \left[ M + \sqrt{M^2 - Q^2} \right]^{-1/2} . \quad (56)$$

In this case as well, note that in the extremal limit, i.e., as  $M \rightarrow Q$ , one essentially obtains a vanishing contribution to  $\Delta M$ . Thus in the case of a higher dimensional charged black hole, in the extremal limit, the quantum spectrum becomes dense again. An identical feature will hold for Logarithmically discretized black hole spectrum as well. Thus one can expect that in higher dimensions too, in the extremal limit, all the black holes in the Kerr-Newman class do produce continuous quantum spectrum, visually contrasting them with the Schwarzschild case.

## 8 Conclusion

In this work, we have studied the emission pattern of a classical black hole which is fundamentally a macroscopic realization of an underlying quantum gravity theory, where some geometric feature of spacetime gets discretized. We have obtained the spacing between distinguishable macroscopic configurations such a hole is allowed to have which will reveal the smallest energy jump between the allowed macro-configuration a black hole could undertake. We obtain the change in the mass of the hole through entropy and subsequent change in the horizon area, if the macroscopic black hole obeys the classical laws. This strategy revealed many interesting features when applied to Kerr-Newman class of black holes. The smallest frequency of emission gets related to the temperature of the hole through the de-Broglie thermal wavelength associated

with the emission profile. This is unlike a normal blackbody where the minimum frequency of emission is determined by the size of the blackbody. Further, a tri-ratio compiled from infrared features was obtained for all black holes, which reveal the parameter of the quantum theory which will be dictating the microphysics. The computations have many significant implications involving black hole information release, life time, scrambling time etc. Below we provide the key findings of this work:

- *Smallest frequency of emission:* The emission profile of the black hole admits a smallest mass (or frequency) gap depending upon two distinct ways in which the macroscopic area can change (by macroscopic we mean anything with a size appreciably large than set by the Planck scale). The area of such a large black hole can either change in integer steps or in logarithm of some integer. This comes just from the micro canonical counting of the entropy and is independent of any quantum modeling whatsoever. If the area changes by integer steps, the minimum frequency a black hole can emit, while jumping to nearest allowed configuration, scales inversely proportional to the hole's mass for the Schwarzschild case. Therefore, the collection of black hole radiation looks vastly discrete given the fact that the semi-classical radiation is expected to be thermal with the temperature inversely related to the mass. Similarly, for the Kerr-Newman black holes too, the minimum frequency gap between the nearest allowed configuration is set by the temperature the black hole is at.

On the other hand, if the black hole area scales as logarithm of some integer, the minimum frequency becomes exponentially small and the spectrum appears rather dense. This will be the regime, like a classical system where number of allowed configurations are accumulated close by.

- *Dense spectrum and extremal limit:* For Kerr-Newman black hole it is possible to consider the extremal limit. In this case the minimum mass gap becomes vanishing. Thus unlike the Schwarzschild scenario in this case the quantum spectrum can become dense, as the rotation parameter and/or charge of the black hole increases. The situation has been explained in Fig. 2. For Logarithmic discretization it immediately follows that the spectrum becomes denser as the extremal limit is approached.
- *Extremal is stable :* In the case of a rotating (or charged) black hole the smallest quanta of emission gets related to the horizon temperature in a linear fashion. Thus, as the extremality parameter rises, the temperature drops down and the smallest frequency of emission also goes down, giving the emission spectra a dense profile. In fact, one can write down a relation between various length scales in the emission i.e, the thermal de Broglie wavelength, the Compton wavelength and the largest wavelength of emission, depending upon whether the horizon area changes as integer or the logarithm of an integer. However, once the extremality parameter becomes unity and the black hole turns extremal, the temperature vanishes and the black hole can no longer emit as the mass gap also shrinks down to zero. Of course, these studies are independent of any particular model and we can only estimate the “in principle” smallest frequency. An exact theory will presumably tell how large from this smallest value of mass gap the change in black hole's parameters will be. Further, in the extremal limit, it is possible to relate the discretization scheme of black holes to quantization of charge, as a charged particle is lowered into the black hole. This favors the integer discretization scenario.
- *Universal features:* Once the black hole turns macroscopic, much of the information of its source quantum character gets washed out. For example, its entropy, mass, maximum number of quanta it could emit would not change. However there are also quantities which know about the effect the quantum theory brought into the macroscopic parameters of the hole. We identified three such quantities: mass gap, time scale and a relation among the length scales. The last one among these is of significant interest. It relates (within a class of discretization) three length scales associated with a

black hole in a universal fashion. Therefore observation of these associated quantities presumably will reveal the parameter (e.g. Immirzi parameter [72], string tension [73], non commutativity parameter of space-time [74] etc. ) nature selected for the black holes' discretization.

- *A road to Planck scale remnant* : Based upon our estimates of the minimum frequency of emission, we can calculate *maximum possible* number of quanta a black hole can emit before it turns extremal and/or becomes Planck sized. One can estimate the number of quanta starting from the initial configuration, upto the time where the classical/semiclassical approximation breaks down. Therefore, one can also estimate the maximum possible information content, available with the radiation, once the evaporation has ended. The total information content in emission will of course be based upon the dimensionality of the Hilbert space of total radiation, an exercise we leave for future. With such emission profile one can also obtain a characteristic time scale of the black hole, which tells us about the time phase corresponding to a particular configuration a black hole adopts in course of emitting radiation. These studies may potentially provide insights regarding at least two crucial issues — (a) a qualitative estimate of the amount of information a black hole is entitled to emit with its correspondence with information loss paradox and (b) an estimate for the lifetime of a black hole, i.e., survivability of a black hole.
- *Correspondence with semi-classical physics*: Whatever be the underlying quantum scenario, it has presumably to reproduce the semi-classical physics in a natural way. We have shown the minimum mass gap of a black hole will still be tallying with the thermodynamical laws of black hole, explicitly depicting how the semi-classical physics can be recovered. Similarly we have shown that the semi-classical bound ensuring extremality can be reached. Moreover we have also demonstrated that if a charge particle is thrown into a rotating extremal black hole, the minimum energy the charge particle must have to result into a final state extremal Kerr-Newman black hole coincides with semi-classical expectations. Thus our analysis is in close correspondence with semi-classical physics.

The results obtained here open up many frontiers of analysis, some of which are already discussed. We will like to pursue these aspects elsewhere. As the most useful insight obtained from this work, we would like to stress here is the infrared region of the black hole emission may be much more richer in terms of revealing the ultraviolet physics a microscopic theory is built up of. Further research in this direction is indeed warranted.

## Acknowledgements

Research of SC is funded by a SERB-NPDF grant (PDF/2016/001589) from SERB, Government of India. Research of KL is supported by INSPIRE Faculty Fellowship grant by Department of Science and Technology, Government of India.

## A Appendix: Polynomial Generalization

Let us assume that the area expectation is polynomially related to the discretizable variable  $\mathcal{Z}$  (This polynomial relation is expected to be originating from a discretizable area operator)

$$A = \sum_m c_m \alpha^m F^m, \quad (57)$$



where we have used the notations and definitions presented in Eq.(2) and Eq.(5) respectively. Moreover, note that  $m$  is supposed to be an integer. Therefore the degeneracy  $g(n)$  associated with this discretization scheme becomes,

$$g(n) = \exp \left[ \sum_m c_m \bar{\alpha}^m F^m \right], \quad (58)$$

where  $\bar{\alpha}^m = \alpha^m/4$ . Thus it is clear that the integer criterion can hold for a variable  $F$  (i.e.,  $F$  changes its values but still the right hand side of Eq.(58) remains an integer) if — (a)  $c_m \bar{\alpha}^m = m \ln I_0$  and  $F = I$ , or (b)  $\bar{\alpha}^m = I_0$  and  $c_m F^m = m \ln I$ , where  $I$ ,  $I_0$  and  $m$  are integers and we have absorbed various constants to scale either  $F$  or  $\bar{\alpha}$ , to be declared as an integer. Clearly choice (b) is little difficult to visualize as an empirical relation as it relates the coefficient of the polynomial to a variable part of a system, still we include the choice (b) in the discussion. Therefore, if choice (a) is realized in nature we will have

$$g(n) = \exp \left[ \ln I_0 \left( \sum_m m I^m \right) \right] = \exp [K \ln I_0], \quad (59)$$

for some variable integer  $K = \sum_m m I^m$ . Therefore, the smallest change in the area could be in unit step. In fact the smallest frequency in the case with higher powers of integer variation leads to a larger minimum frequency (see, [41] for details). Thus the smallest frequency calculation presented in the manuscript remains true for the polynomial generalization of the relation as well. On the other hand, for the case (b) we will have

$$g(n) = \exp [\ln I \sum_m m I_0^m] = \exp [K' \ln I], \quad (60)$$

for a fixed integer  $K' = \sum_m m I_0^m$  and hence the discussion with logarithmic step jump follows.

## B Appendix: quantum gravitational correction to the area relation

From various quantum gravity models, the area entropy relation are expected to receive subdominant corrections of quantum gravitational origin [59, 72, 75, 76] of the form

$$S = \frac{A}{4l_p^2} + \frac{p}{q} \ln \frac{\sigma A}{4l_p^2}, \quad (61)$$

where  $p$  and  $q$  are some integers and  $l_p$  corresponds to the Planck length, where as  $\sigma$  is a constant. Using the expression for area in terms of discretized geometrical operator, it follows that the above expression can be written as,

$$S = \frac{\bar{\alpha}^\gamma}{4l_p^2} F^\gamma + \frac{p}{q} \ln \frac{\sigma \bar{\alpha}^\gamma}{4l_p^2} F^\gamma. \quad (62)$$

So far we have based our analysis on the leading order entropy-area relation. However in view of the above correction it is legitimate to ask the effect of the Logarithmic correction of area on the discrete quantum

spectrum. We will show that such corrections terms will restrain the discretization scheme significantly and will also lead to more sparse emission spectrum. The number of microstates associated with the expression for entropy as presented in Eq.(61) can be expressed as

$$\ln g(n) = \frac{\bar{\alpha}^\gamma}{4l_p^2} F^\gamma + \frac{p}{q} \ln \frac{\sigma \bar{\alpha}^\gamma}{4l_p^2} F^\gamma . \quad (63)$$

Therefore, it immediately follows from the above expression that,

$$g(n)^q = F^{p\gamma} \exp \tilde{\beta} F^\gamma , \quad (64)$$

where we have absorbed the constants  $\sigma$  and  $\bar{\alpha}^\gamma/4l_p^2\sigma^\gamma$  in the redefinition of  $F^\gamma$  and in defining a new parameter  $\tilde{\beta}$ . Clearly for  $g(n)$  to be an integer with  $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , one requires  $\tilde{\beta} = \ln I_0$  and  $F^\gamma = I$  to be the only possibility, where  $I$  and  $I_0$  are integers. Therefore the discussion with the integer step area variation as presented in Section 3 will dictate the emission profile. For the case  $p < 0$  one can obtain a superset of solution space from

$$g(n)^q = F^{-|p|\gamma} \exp \tilde{\beta} F^\gamma , \quad (65)$$

again leading to the same result as above, though with the use of a further condition :  $I = nI_0$  for some integer  $n$ . Thus quantum gravity corrections in microcanonical counting scheme will also lead to a largely discretize the black hole emission spectra.

## References

- [1] J. D. Bekenstein, “Generalized second law of thermodynamics in black hole physics,” *Phys. Rev.* **D9** (1974) 3292–3300.
- [2] J. M. Bardeen, B. Carter, and S. W. Hawking, “The Four laws of black hole mechanics,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **31** (1973) 161–170.
- [3] G. W. Gibbons and S. W. Hawking, “Cosmological Event Horizons, Thermodynamics, and Particle Creation,” *Phys. Rev.* **D15** (1977) 2738–2751.
- [4] S. W. Hawking, “Black Holes and Thermodynamics,” *Phys. Rev.* **D13** (1976) 191–197.
- [5] J. D. Bekenstein, “Black holes and entropy,” *Phys. Rev.* **D7** (1973) 2333–2346.
- [6] J. D. Bekenstein, “Black holes and the second law,” *Lett. Nuovo Cim.* **4** (1972) 737–740.
- [7] S. W. Hawking, “Particle Creation by Black Holes,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **43** (1975) 199–220. [erratum, ibid, 167(1975)].
- [8] T. Jacobson, “Thermodynamics of space-time: The Einstein equation of state,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75** (1995) 1260–1263, [arXiv:gr-qc/9504004](#) [gr-qc].
- [9] T. Padmanabhan, “Thermodynamical Aspects of Gravity: New insights,” *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **73** (2010) 046901, [arXiv:0911.5004](#) [gr-qc].

- [10] T. Padmanabhan, “General Relativity from a Thermodynamic Perspective,” *Gen.Rel.Grav.* **46** (2014) 1673, [arXiv:1312.3253 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [11] J. M. Maldacena, *Black holes in string theory*. PhD thesis, Princeton U., 1996. [arXiv:hep-th/9607235 \[hep-th\]](#). <http://wwwlib.umi.com/dissertations/fullcit?p9627605>.
- [12] C. Rovelli, “Black hole entropy from loop quantum gravity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77** (1996) 3288–3291, [arXiv:gr-qc/9603063 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [13] F. Dowker, “Causal sets and the deep structure of spacetime,” in *100 Years Of Relativity: space-time structure: Einstein and beyond*, A. Ashtekar, ed., pp. 445–464. 2005. [arXiv:gr-qc/0508109 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [14] A. Ashtekar, J. Baez, A. Corichi, and K. Krasnov, “Quantum geometry and black hole entropy,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80** (1998) 904–907, [arXiv:gr-qc/9710007 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [15] S. W. Hawking, “Breakdown of Predictability in Gravitational Collapse,” *Phys. Rev.* **D14** (1976) 2460–2473.
- [16] M. Visser, “Thermality of the Hawking flux,” *JHEP* **07** (2015) 009, [arXiv:1409.7754 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [17] S. D. Mathur, “Emission rates, the correspondence principle and the information paradox,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B529** (1998) 295–320, [arXiv:hep-th/9706151 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [18] S. D. Mathur, “The Information paradox: A Pedagogical introduction,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **26** (2009) 224001, [arXiv:0909.1038 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [19] G. ’t Hooft, “Diagonalizing the Black Hole Information Retrieval Process,” [arXiv:1509.01695 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [20] S. Chakraborty and K. Lochan, “Black Holes: Eliminating Information or Illuminating New Physics?,” *Universe* **3** no. 3, (2017) 55, [arXiv:1702.07487 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [21] S. W. Hawking, M. J. Perry, and A. Strominger, “Soft Hair on Black Holes,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116** no. 23, (2016) 231301, [arXiv:1601.00921 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [22] S. W. Hawking, M. J. Perry, and A. Strominger, “Superrotation Charge and Supertranslation Hair on Black Holes,” [arXiv:1611.09175 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [23] S. K. Modak, L. Ortniz, I. Pesa, and D. Sudarsky, “Black hole evaporation: information loss but no paradox,” *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **47** no. 10, (2015) 120, [arXiv:1406.4898 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [24] P. Kraus and S. D. Mathur, “Nature abhors a horizon,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **D24** no. 12, (2015) 1543003, [arXiv:1505.05078 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [25] S. W. Hawking, “Information Preservation and Weather Forecasting for Black Holes,” [arXiv:1401.5761 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [26] V. P. Frolov, “Do Black Holes Exist?,” in *Proceedings, 18th International Seminar on High Energy Physics (Quarks 2014): Suzdal, Russia, June 2-8, 2014*. 2014. [arXiv:1411.6981 \[hep-th\]](#). <https://inspirehep.net/record/1329948/files/arXiv:1411.6981.pdf>.

- [27] C. Vaz, “Quantum gravitational dust collapse does not result in a black hole,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B891** (2015) 558–569, [arXiv:1407.3823 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [28] **Virgo, LIGO Scientific** Collaboration, B. P. Abbott *et al.*, “Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Black Hole Merger,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116** no. 6, (2016) 061102, [arXiv:1602.03837 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [29] **Virgo, LIGO Scientific** Collaboration, B. P. Abbott *et al.*, “GW151226: Observation of Gravitational Waves from a 22-Solar-Mass Binary Black Hole Coalescence,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116** no. 24, (2016) 241103, [arXiv:1606.04855 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [30] J. Abedi, H. Dykaar, and N. Afshordi, “Echoes from the abyss: Tentative evidence for planck-scale structure at black hole horizons,” *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (Oct, 2017) 082004. <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.96.082004>.
- [31] V. F. Foit and M. Kleban, “Testing Quantum Black Holes with Gravitational Waves,” [arXiv:1611.07009 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [32] V. Cardoso and P. Pani, “Tests for the existence of horizons through gravitational wave echoes,” *Nat. Astron.* **1** (2017) 586–591, [arXiv:1709.01525 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [33] A. Maselli, P. Pani, R. Cotesta, L. Gualtieri, V. Ferrari, and L. Stella, “Geodesic models of quasi-periodic-oscillations as probes of quadratic gravity,” *Astrophys. J.* **843** no. 1, (2017) 25, [arXiv:1703.01472 \[astro-ph.HE\]](#).
- [34] V. Cardoso, E. Franzin, A. Maselli, P. Pani, and G. Raposo, “Testing strong-field gravity with tidal Love numbers,” *Phys. Rev. D* **95** no. 8, (2017) 084014, [arXiv:1701.01116 \[gr-qc\]](#). [Addendum: *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, no. 8, 089901(2017)].
- [35] A. Alonso-Serrano and M. Visser, “On burning a lump of coal,” *Phys. Lett.* **B757** (2016) 383–386, [arXiv:1511.01162 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [36] K. Lochan and T. Padmanabhan, “Extracting information about the initial state from the black hole radiation,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116** no. 5, (2016) 051301, [arXiv:1507.06402 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [37] K. Lochan, S. Chakraborty, and T. Padmanabhan, “Information retrieval from black holes,” *Phys. Rev. D* **94** no. 4, (2016) 044056, [arXiv:1604.04987 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [38] S. Chakraborty and K. Lochan, “Quantum leaps of black holes: Magnifying glasses of quantum gravity,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **25** (2016) 1644024, [arXiv:1606.04348 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [39] A. Saini and D. Stojkovic, “Radiation from a collapsing object is manifestly unitary,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114** no. 11, (2015) 111301, [arXiv:1503.01487 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [40] P. Chen, Y. C. Ong, and D.-h. Yeom, “Black Hole Remnants and the Information Loss Paradox,” *Phys. Rept.* **603** (2015) 1–45, [arXiv:1412.8366 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [41] K. Lochan and S. Chakraborty, “Discrete quantum spectrum of black holes,” *Phys. Lett.* **B755** (2016) 37–42, [arXiv:1509.09010 \[gr-qc\]](#).

- [42] F. Gray, S. Schuster, A. VanâĂŞBrunt, and M. Visser, “The Hawking cascade from a black hole is extremely sparse,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **33** no. 11, (2016) 115003, [arXiv:1506.03975 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [43] S. Hod, “The Hawking evaporation process of rapidly-rotating black holes: An almost continuous cascade of gravitons,” *Eur. Phys. J.* **C75** no. 7, (2015) 329, [arXiv:1506.05457 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [44] S. Hod, “The entropy emission properties of near-extremal Reissner-Nordström black holes,” *Phys. Rev.* **D93** no. 10, (2016) 104027, [arXiv:1606.04944 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [45] S. Hod, “The Hawking cascades of gravitons from higher-dimensional Schwarzschild black holes,” *Phys. Lett.* **B756** (2016) 133–136, [arXiv:1605.08440 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [46] J. D. Bekenstein and V. F. Mukhanov, “Spectroscopy of the quantum black hole,” *Phys. Lett.* **B360** (1995) 7–12, [arXiv:gr-qc/9505012 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [47] S. Hod, “Bohr’s correspondence principle and the area spectrum of quantum black holes,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81** (1998) 4293, [arXiv:gr-qc/9812002 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [48] S. Hod, “Gravitation, the quantum, and Bohr’s correspondence principle,” *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **31** (1999) 1639, [arXiv:gr-qc/0002002 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [49] M. Barreira, M. Carfora, and C. Rovelli, “Physics with nonperturbative quantum gravity: Radiation from a quantum black hole,” *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **28** (1996) 1293–1299, [arXiv:gr-qc/9603064 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [50] A. Sen, “Microscopic and macroscopic entropy of extremal black holes in string theory,” *General Relativity and Gravitation* **46** no. 5, (Apr, 2014) 1711. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10714-014-1711-5>.
- [51] R. K. Kaul, “Entropy of quantum black holes,” *SIGMA* **8** (2012) 005, [arXiv:1201.6102 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [52] C. Rovelli, “Black holes have more states than those giving the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy: a simple argument,” [arXiv:1710.00218 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [53] S. Chakraborty, *Classical and Quantum Aspects of Gravity in Relation to The Emergent Paradigm*. Springer, 2017.
- [54] J. D. Bekenstein, “The quantum mass spectrum of the kerr black hole,” *Lettere al Nuovo Cimento (1971-1985)* **11** no. 9, (Nov, 1974) 467–470. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02762768>.
- [55] A. V. Kotwal and S. Hofmann, “Discrete energy spectrum of Hawking radiation from Schwarzschild surfaces,” [arXiv:hep-ph/0204117 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [56] O. Dreyer, “Quasinormal modes, the area spectrum, and black hole entropy,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90** (2003) 081301, [arXiv:gr-qc/0211076 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [57] E. Berti, V. Cardoso, and A. O. Starinets, “Quasinormal modes of black holes and black branes,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **26** (2009) 163001, [arXiv:0905.2975 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [58] S. Chakraborty, K. Chakravarti, S. Bose, and S. SenGupta, “Signatures of extra dimensions in gravitational waves from black hole quasi-normal modes,” [arXiv:1710.05188 \[gr-qc\]](#).

- [59] A. Sen, “Logarithmic Corrections to Schwarzschild and Other Non-extremal Black Hole Entropy in Different Dimensions,” *JHEP* **04** (2013) 156, [arXiv:1205.0971 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [60] S. Chakraborty, S. Bhattacharya, and T. Padmanabhan, “Entropy of a generic null surface from its associated Virasoro algebra,” *Phys. Lett.* **B763** (2016) 347–351, [arXiv:1605.06988 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [61] S. Bhattacharya, S. Chakraborty, and T. Padmanabhan, “Entropy of a box of gas in an external gravitational field - revisited,” *Phys. Rev.* **D96** no. 8, (2017) 084030, [arXiv:1702.08723 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [62] B. Sathyaprakash *et al.*, “Scientific Objectives of Einstein Telescope,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **29** (2012) 124013, [arXiv:1206.0331 \[gr-qc\]](#). [Erratum: *Class. Quant. Grav.* 30,079501(2013)].
- [63] S. Chakraborty, S. Singh, and T. Padmanabhan, “A quantum peek inside the black hole event horizon,” *JHEP* **06** (2015) 192, [arXiv:1503.01774 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [64] S. Singh and S. Chakraborty, “Black hole kinematics: The  $\Lambda$ -vacuum energy density and flux for different observers,” *Phys. Rev.* **D90** no. 2, (2014) 024011, [arXiv:1404.0684 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [65] N. Margolus and L. B. Levitin, “The maximum speed of dynamical evolution,” *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* **120** no. 1, (1998) 188 – 195.  
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167278998000542>. Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Physics and Consumption.
- [66] S. Hod, “A lower bound on the Bekenstein-Hawking temperature of black holes,” *Phys. Lett.* **B759** (2016) 541, [arXiv:1701.00492 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [67] R. Emparan and H. S. Reall, “Black Holes in Higher Dimensions,” *Living Rev. Rel.* **11** (2008) 6, [arXiv:0801.3471 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [68] R. C. Myers and M. J. Perry, “Black Holes in Higher Dimensional Space-Times,” *Annals Phys.* **172** (1986) 304.
- [69] P. Kanti, “Black holes in theories with large extra dimensions: A Review,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A19** (2004) 4899–4951, [arXiv:hep-ph/0402168 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [70] V. P. Frolov and D. Kubiznak, “Hidden Symmetries of Higher Dimensional Rotating Black Holes,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98** (2007) 011101, [arXiv:gr-qc/0605058 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [71] T. Padmanabhan, *Gravitation: Foundations and Frontiers*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2010.
- [72] A. Ghosh and P. Mitra, “A Bound on the log correction to the black hole area law,” *Phys. Rev.* **D71** (2005) 027502, [arXiv:gr-qc/0401070 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [73] C. G. Callan, Jr., R. C. Myers, and M. J. Perry, “Black Holes in String Theory,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B311** (1989) 673–698.
- [74] P. Nicolini, A. Smailagic, and E. Spallucci, “Noncommutative geometry inspired Schwarzschild black hole,” *Phys. Lett.* **B632** (2006) 547–551, [arXiv:gr-qc/0510112 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [75] K. Lochan and C. Vaz, “Canonical Partition function of Loop Black Holes,” *Phys. Rev.* **D85** (2012) 104041, [arXiv:1202.2301 \[gr-qc\]](#).

- [76] K. Lochan and C. Vaz, “Statistical analysis of entropy correction from topological defects in Loop Black Holes,” *Phys. Rev.* **D86** (2012) 044035, [arXiv:1205.3974 \[gr-qc\]](#).